This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

CONFIDENTIAL LJUBLJANA 000039

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR EUR/NCE, NP/RA (SONTAG), L/NP (HERR), AND L/LEI (MANNING)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 01/19/2015
TAGS: KNNP KTIA MNUC PARM PREL PHSA EWWT SI
SUBJECT: SLOVENIA: LITTLE EU SUPPORT FOR U.S. AMENDMENTS TO
SUA CONVENTION

REF: A. SECSTATE 4828

1B. EMAIL CROSBY TO SONTAG ET AL - 01/14/2005

Classified By: Deputy Chief of Mission Dean J. Haas for reasons 1.4(b) and (d).

- 11. (C) As reported ref B, Pol-Miloff delivered ref A talking points on 12 January to MFA Security Policy Department staffer Bostjan Jerman, who serves as MFA's point person for non-proliferation issues. Jerman read through the points and issue paper with interest, remarked that UNSCR 1540 is seen as very important by the EU and its member states, and opined that Slovenia would have no problem supporting the U.S. position on either issue: dual use offenses or non-state actors. He said he would forward the points to MFA Legal and to the appropriate person in Slovenia's Mission to the EU in Brussels, noting that the Slovenes would be represented at the 17 January COMAR meeting. Jerman noted that he had not been aware of the impact of the Indonesian proposal and expressed appreciation for the helpful policy issues paper.
- (C) After an unrelated demarche on 20 January, Pol-Miloff asked Jerman if Slovenia had been able to send a representative to the 17 January COMAR meeting. replied that Undersecretary Aleksander Cicerov, from MFA's Legal Department, had attended the meeting with Jerman's recommendation that Slovenia support the U.S. position on both open issues. Jerman had not received a readout of the meeting; however, Jerman and Pol-Miloff encountered Cicerov on the way out of the MFA. Asked by Jerman about the outcome of the COMAR meeting, Cicerov replied that the attendees had decided not to support the U.S. positions. Perplexed, Pol-Miloff asked what happened. Cicerov said that he and the other COMAR attendees had all received the U.S. position papers and collectively wondered why they had been contacted about the open issues. He said the attendees decided that the U.S. overture amounted to an inappropriate attempt at politically pressuring fellow IMO Legal Committee members, and he opined that the U.S. should have delivered its position through the Committee chair. Pol-Miloff clarified that the intent of disseminating the paper was to achieve a better-informed and more streamlined process for reaching an agreement within the Committee, stressing that there was no political pressure intended and that the U.S. overture should not be seen in such a light. ROBERTSON

NNNN

2005LJUBLJ00039 - Classification: CONFIDENTIAL

v1.6.2